



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/526,554	05/09/2006	Hyun-Kwon Chung	0001.1044	4297
49455 7590 12/30/2008 STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP 1400 EYE STREET, NW SUITE 300 WASHINGTON, DC 20005				
EXAMINER				
TEKLE, DANIEL T				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2621				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/30/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/526,554

Applicant(s)

CHUNG ET AL.

Examiner

DANIEL TEKLE

Art Unit

2621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 May 2006.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on 09 May 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claim 1-12, 14-15, 23-24 and 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kelly et al. (US 6,047,292).

Regarding Claim 1: Kelly et al. discloses a reproducing apparatus which includes a browser, to reproduce data on an information storage medium having registry information, the reproducing apparatus comprising: a search unit let searching for the registry information based on an input search parameter (**column 7 lines 46-65**); and a search interface unit receiving the input search parameter from the browser and providing the input search parameter to the search unit, and receiving text information from the search unit and transmitting the text information to the browser (**column 5 lines 51-67**).

Regarding Claim 2: Kelly et al. discloses a reproducing apparatus of claim 1, wherein the registry information comprises a text data manager defined in a digital versatile disc (DVD) (**column 3 lines 56-67**).

Regarding Claim 3: Kelly et al. disclose a reproducing apparatus of claim 2, wherein

the search interface unit comprises an application program interface (API) (**column 5 lines 51-67**).

Regarding Claim 4: Kelly et al. discloses a reproducing apparatus of claim 3, wherein the browser includes an analysis engine for analyzing a predetermined client program inserted into a markup document, and the client program comprises the search interface unit (**column 5 lines 42-50**).

Regarding Claim 5: Kelly et al. discloses a reproducing apparatus of claim 4, wherein the client program is a Java Applet or JavaScript program (**column 5 lines 1-13**), and the search interface unit is realized by at least one method defined in a class having a property parameter (**column 7 lines 46-65**), the property parameter indicating at least one portion of the text information included in the text data manager (**column 7 lines 46-65**).

Regarding Claim 6: Kelly et al. discloses a reproducing apparatus of claim 5, wherein the search interface unit includes: a search method searching the text data manager (**column 7 lines 13-28**); and a property parameter which is included in the class, receiving the text information on the text data manager (**column 7 lines 13-46**).

Regarding Claim 7: Kelly et al. discloses a reproducing apparatus of claim 6, wherein the search interface unit further comprises: a previous search method searching for data prior to the text information of the search method (**Fig. 8**).

Regarding Claim 8: Kelly et al. discloses a reproducing apparatus of claim 6, wherein the search interface unit further comprises: a next search method searching for data posterior to the text information of the search method (**Fig. 8**).

Regarding Claim 9: Kelly et al. disclose a reproducing apparatus of claim 4, wherein the web document is recorded on the medium DVD (**column 5 lines 43-50**).

Regarding Claim 10: Kelly et al. discloses a reproducing apparatus of claim 1, wherein the search unit comprises, firmware, which interacts with the search interface unit (**column 6 lines 56-67**).

Regarding Claim 11: Kelly et al. discloses a reproducing apparatus of claim 10, wherein the search unit comprises: a search module searching for text data which matches with the input search parameter received from the search interface unit (**column 7 lines 13-28 and Fig. 8**); and an extraction module extracting the matched text data searched by the search module and transmitting the extracted text data to the search interface unit (**column 7 lines 13-28 and Fig. 8**).

Regarding Claim 12: Claim 12 is rejected for the same subject matter as claim 1 discussed above.

Regarding Claim 14-15: Claim 14-15 are rejected for the same subject matter as claim 2-3 respectively discussed above.

Regarding Claim 23: Claim 23 is rejected for the same subject matter as claim 1 and 12 discussed above.

Regarding Claim 24: Claim 24 is rejected for the same subject matter as claim 1 discussed above.

Regarding Claim 26: Claim 26 is rejected for the same subject matter as claim 14 discussed above.

Regarding Claim 27: Claim 27 is rejected for the same subject matter as claim 2 discussed above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 13, 16-22, 25 and 28 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kelly et al. (US 6,047,292).

Regarding Claim 13: Kelly et al. discloses all the limitation of claim 12, except deletion interface unit; however the use of delete interface unit is well known in the art and an official notes is taken.

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine deletion interface unit into Kelly et al. art in order to delete unnecessary video continents from storage device.

Regarding Claim 16: Kelly et al. discloses all the limitation of claim 12, except deletion interface unit; however the use of delete interface unit is well known in the art and an official notes is taken.

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine deletion interface unit into Kelly et al. art in order to delete unnecessary video continents from storage device.

Regarding Claim 17: Claim 17 is rejected for the same subject matter as claim 5 and 13 discussed above.

Regarding Claim 18: Kelly et al. discloses a recording apparatus of claim 17, wherein the recording interface unit includes a recording method; which records the text information to be included in the text data manager (**column 7 lines 13-28**).

Regarding Claim 19: Claim 19 is rejected for the same subject matter as claim 13 discussed above.

Regarding Claim 20: Kelly et al. discloses a recording apparatus of claim 17, wherein the search interface unit includes: a search method searching the text data manager (**column 7 lines 13-28**); and a property parameter; which is included in the class; receiving the text information on the text data manager (**column 7 lines 13-46**).

Regarding Claim 21: Kelly et al. discloses a recording apparatus of claim 20, wherein the search interface unit further comprises a previous search method searching data prior to the text information of the search method (**Fig. 8**).

Regarding Claim 22: Kelly et al. discloses a recording apparatus of claim 20, wherein the search interface unit further comprises a next search method let--searching data posterior to the text information of the search method (**Fig. 8**).

Regarding Claim 25: Claim 25 is rejected for the same subject matter as claim 13 discussed above.

Regarding Claim 28: Claim 28 is rejected for the same subject matter as claim 13 discussed above.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DANIEL TEKLE whose telephone number is (571)270-1117. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30am to 5:00pm M-R and 7:30-4:00 Every other Friday..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marsha D. Banks-Harold can be reached on 571-272-7905. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/526,554
Art Unit: 2621

Page 8

/Marsha D. Banks-Harold/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2621
/Daniel Tekle/
Examiner, Art Unit 2621